arXiv:1612.04018v1 [math.NA] 13 Dec 2016

TRIGONOMETRIC INTERPOLATION AND QUADRATURE IN PERTURBED POINTS

ANTHONY P. AUSTIN* AND LLOYD N. TREFETHEN†

Abstract. The trigonometric interpolants to a periodic function f in equispaced points converge if f is Dini-continuous, and the associated quadrature formula, the trapezoidal rule, converges if f is continuous. What if the points are perturbed? With equispaced grid spacing h, let each point be perturbed by an arbitrary amount $\le \alpha h$, where $\alpha \in [0, 1/2)$ is a fixed constant. The Kadec 1/4 theorem of sampling theory suggests there may be be trouble for $\alpha \ge 1/4$. We show that convergence of both the interpolants and the quadrature estimates is guaranteed for all $\alpha < 1/2$ if f is twice continuously differentiable, with the convergence rate depending on the smoothness of f. More precisely it is enough for f to have 4α derivatives in a certain sense, and we conjecture that 2α derivatives is enough. Connections with the Fejér–Kalmár theorem are discussed.

Key words. trigonometric interpolation, quadrature, Lebesgue constant, Kadec 1/4 theorem, Fejér–Kalmár theorem, sampling theory

AMS subject classifications. 42A15, 65D32, 94A20

1. Introduction and summary of results. The basic question of robustness of mathematical algorithms is, what happens if the data are perturbed? Yet little literature exists on the effect on interpolants, or on quadratures, of perturbing the interpolation points.

The questions addressed in this paper arise in two almost equivalent settings: interpolation by algebraic polynomials (e.g., in Gauss or Chebyshev points) and periodic interpolation by trigonometric polynomials (e.g., in equispaced points). Although we believe essentially the same results hold in the two settings, this paper deals with just the trigonometric case. Let f be a real or complex function on $[-\pi, \pi)$, which we take to be 2π-periodic in the sense that any assumptions of continuity or smoothness made for f apply periodically at $x = -\pi$ as well as at interior points. For each $N \ge 0$, set $K = 2N + 1$, and consider the centered grid of K equispaced points in $[-\pi, \pi)$,

$$x_k = kh, \quad -N \le k \le N, \quad h = \frac{2\pi}{K}. \tag{1.1}$$

There is a unique degree-N trigonometric interpolant through the data $\{f(x_k)\}$, by

*austina@anl.gov, Mathematics and Computer Science Division, Argonne National Laboratory, 9700 S. Cass Ave., Lemont, IL 60439

†trefethen@maths.ox.ac.uk, Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford, Oxford, OX2 6GG, UK.

Both authors were supported by the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007–2013)/ERC grant agreement no. 291068. The views expressed in this article are not those of the ERC or the European Commission, and the European Union is not liable for any use that may be made of the information contained here. The work of the first author was additionally supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, under contract number DE-AC02-06CH11357.

The submitted manuscript has been created by UChicago Argonne, LLC, Operator of Argonne National Laboratory ("Argonne"). Argonne, a U.S. Department of Energy Office of Science laboratory, is operated under Contract No. DE-AC02-06CH11357. The U.S. Government retains for itself, and others acting on its behalf, a paid-up nonexclusive, irrevocable worldwide license in said article to reproduce, prepare derivative works, distribute copies to the public, and perform publicly and display publicly, by or on behalf of the Government. The Department of Energy will provide public access to these results of federally sponsored research in accordance with the DOE Public Access Plan. http://energy.gov/downloads/doe-public-access-plan.

which we mean a function

$$t_N(x) = \sum_{k=-N}^{N} c_k e^{ikx} \tag{1.2}$$

with $t_N(x_k) = f(x_k)$ for each k. If I denotes the integral of f,

$$I = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(x)\,dx, \tag{1.3}$$

the associated quadrature approximation is the integral of $t_N(x)$, which can be shown to be equal to the result of applying the trapezoidal rule to f:

$$I_N = h \sum_{k=-N}^{N} f(x_k) = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} t_N(x)\,dx = 2\pi c_0. \tag{1.4}$$

It is known that if f is continuous, then

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} |I - I_N| = 0, \tag{1.5}$$

and if f is Dini-continuous, for which Hölder or Lipschitz continuity are sufficient conditions, then

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \|f - t_N\| = 0. \tag{1.6}$$

Moreover, the convergence rates are tied to the smoothness of f, with exponential convergence if f is analytic. Here and throughout, $\|\cdot\|$ is the maximum norm on $[-\pi, \pi)$.

The problem addressed in this paper is the generalization of these results to configurations in which the interpolation points are perturbed. For fixed $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$, consider a set of points

$$\tilde{x}_k = x_k + s_k h, \quad -N \le k \le N, \quad |s_k| \le \alpha\,. \tag{1.7}$$

Note that since $\alpha < 1/2$, the $\tilde{x}_k$ are necessarily distinct. Let $\tilde{t}_N(x)$ be the unique degree-N trigonometric interpolant to $\{f(\tilde{x}_k)\}$, and let $\tilde{I}_N = \int \tilde{t}_N(x)dx$ be the corresponding quadrature approximation. As in (1.4), this will be a linear combination of the function values, although no longer with equal weights in general.

Let $\sigma > 0$ be any positive real number, and write $\sigma = \nu + \gamma$ with $\gamma \in (0, 1]$. We say that f *has* σ *derivatives* if f is ν times continuously differentiable and, moreover, $f^{(\nu)}$ is Hölder continuous with exponent γ. Note that if σ is an integer, then for f to "have σ derivatives" means that f is $\sigma - 1$ times continuously differentiable and $f^{(\sigma-1)}$ is Lipschitz continuous. We will prove the following main theorem, whose central estimate is the bound on $\|f - \tilde{t}_N\|$ in (1.9). The estimates (1.8)–(1.9) are new, whereas (1.10) follows from the work of Kis [11], as discussed in Section 3. Numerical illustrations of these bounds can be found in [1].

THEOREM 1.1. *For any $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$, if f is twice continuously differentiable, then*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} |I - \tilde{I}_N| = \lim_{N\to\infty} \|f - \tilde{t}_N\| = 0. \tag{1.8}$$

More precisely, if f has σ derivatives for some $\sigma > 4\alpha$, then

$$|I - \tilde{I}_N|, \|f - \tilde{t}_N\| = O(N^{4\alpha-\sigma}). \tag{1.9}$$

If f can be analytically continued to a 2π-periodic function for $-a < \operatorname{Im} x < a$ for some $a > 0$, then for any $\hat{a} < a$,

$$|I - \tilde{I}_N|, \|f - \tilde{t}_N\| = O(e^{-\hat{a}N}). \tag{1.10}$$

Our proofs are based on combining standard estimates of approximation theory, the Jackson theorems, with a new bound on the Lebesgue constants associated with perturbed grids, Theorem 2.1. Our bounds are close to sharp, but not quite. Based on extensive numerical experiments presented in Section 3.3.2 of [1], we conjecture that 4α can be improved to 2α in (1.9) and (2.2); for (2.2) the result would probably then be sharp, but for (1.9) a slight further improvement may still be possible. For the quadrature problem in particular, further experiments presented in Section 3.5.2 of [1] lead us to conjecture that $\tilde{I}_N \to I$ as $N \to \infty$ for all continuous functions f for all $\alpha < 1/2$. This conjecture is based on the theory of Pólya in 1933 [14], who showed that such convergence is ensured if and only if the sums of the absolute values of the quadrature weights are bounded as $N \to \infty$. Experiments indicate that for all $\alpha < 1/2$, these sums are indeed bounded as required. On the other hand, $\tilde{I}_N \to I$ cannot be guaranteed for any $\alpha \geq 1/2$, since in that case the interpolation points may come together, making the quadrature weights unbounded.

Theorems 1.1 and 2.1 suggest that from the point of view of approximation and quadrature, $\alpha = 1/4$ is not a special value. In Section 4 we comment on the significance of the appearance of this number in the Kadec 1/4 theorem and more generally on the relationship between approximation theory and sampling theory, two subjects that address closely related questions and yet have little overlap of literatures or experts.

All the estimates reported here were worked out by the first author and presented in his D. Phil. thesis [1]. This work was motivated by work of the second author with Weideman in the review article "The exponentially convergent trapezoidal rule" [16]. It is well known that on an equispaced periodic grid, the trapezoidal rule is exponentially convergent for periodic analytic integrands [4, 16]. With perturbed points, it seemed to us that exponential convergence should still be expected, and we were surprised to find that there seemed to be no literature on this subject. A preliminary discussion was given in [16, Sec. 9].

Section 2 reduces Theorem 1.1 to a bound on the Lebesgue constant, Theorem 2.1. Sections 3 and 4 are devoted to comments on problems with $\alpha \geq 1/2$ and on the link with sampling theory and Kadec's theorem, respectively. Section 5 outlines the proof of Theorem 2.1.

2. Reduction to a Lebesgue constant estimate. A fundamental tool of approximation theory is the Lebesgue constant: for any linear projection $L : f \mapsto t$, the Lebesgue constant is the operator norm $\Lambda = \|L\|$. For our problem the operator is the map $\tilde{L}_N$ from a function f to its trigonometric interpolant $\tilde{t}_N$ through the values $\{f(\tilde{x}_k)\}$, and the norm on L is the operator norm induced by $\|\cdot\|$, the ∞-norm on $[-\pi, \pi)$. We denote the Lebesgue constant by $\tilde{\Lambda}_N$.

Lebesgue constants are linked to quality of approximations by the following well-known bound. If $\tilde{\Lambda}_N$ is the Lebesgue constant associated with the projection $\tilde{L}_N$:

$f \mapsto \tilde{t}_N$ and t_N^* is the best approximation to f of degree N, then

$$\|f - \tilde{t}_N\| \le (1 + \tilde{\Lambda}_N)\|f - t_N^*\|. \tag{2.1}$$

It follows that if $\tilde{\Lambda}_N$ is small, then $\tilde{t}_N$ is a near-optimal approximation to f. If f has a certain smoothness property for which the optimal approximations t_N^* are known to converge at a certain rate, this implies that the interpolants $\tilde{t}_N$ converge at nearly the same rate.

Applying (2.1), we prove Theorem 1.1 by combining a bound on the Lebesgue constants $\tilde{\Lambda}_N$ with bounds on the best approximation errors $\|f - t_N^*\|$. Our estimates of best approximations are standard Jackson theorems, going back to Dunham Jackson in 1911 and 1912. The nonstandard part of the argument, which from a technical point of view is the main contribution of this paper, is the following estimate of the Lebesgue constant, the proof of which is outlined in Section 5.

THEOREM 2.1. *There is a universal constant C such that*

$$\tilde{\Lambda}_N \le \frac{C(N^{4\alpha} - 1)}{\alpha(1 - 2\alpha)} \tag{2.2}$$

for all $\alpha \in [0, 1/2)$ and $N > 0$. For $\alpha = 0$ this bound is to be interpreted by its limiting value given, for example, by L'Hopital's rule, $\tilde{\Lambda}_N \le 4C \log N$.

The $\log N$ bound for an equispaced grid with $\alpha = 0$ is standard, so the substantive result here concerns $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$. This is what we can prove, but as mentioned in the previous section, based on numerical experiments, we conjecture that (2.2) actually holds with $N^{4\alpha}$ replaced by $N^{2\alpha}$.

Given Theorem 2.1, we prove Theorem 1.1 as follows.

Proof of Theorem 1.1*, given Theorem* 2.1. The Jackson theorems of approximation theory relate the smoothness of a function f to the accuracy of its best approximations [8, 12]. According to one of these theorems, given for example as Theorem 41 of [12], if f is a periodic function on $[-\pi, \pi)$ that has σ derivatives for some $\sigma > 0$ in the sense defined in Section 1, then

$$\|f - t_N^*\| = O(N^{-\sigma}). \tag{2.3}$$

Combining this with Theorem 2.1 gives (1.9). The bound (1.10) follows similarly from the estimate

$$\|f - t_N^*\| = O(e^{-\hat{a}N}) \tag{2.4}$$

for any 2π-periodic function f analytic and bounded in the strip of half-width $\hat{a} > 0$ about the real axis; see, for example, eq. (7.17) of [16]. □

3. $\alpha \ge 1/2$, confluent points, and analytic functions. Our framework (1.7) for perturbed points can be generalized to values $\alpha \ge 1/2$. For $\alpha \in [1/2, 1)$, two grid points may coalesce, so one must assume that f' exists in order to ensure that there are appropriate data to define an interpolation problem (in this case, trigonometric Hermite interpolation). Similarly for $\alpha \in [1, 3/2)$, three points may coalesce, so one must assume f'' exists; and so on analogously for any finite value of α. (We wrap grid points around as necessary if the perturbation moves them outside of $[-\pi, \pi)$; equivalently, one could extend f periodically.)

Looking at the statement of Theorem 1.1 but considering values $\alpha \geq 1/2$, one notes that the assumption of $\sigma > 4\alpha$ derivatives is enough to ensure that the necessary derivatives exist for the interpolation problem to make sense; the conjectured sharper condition of $\sigma > 2\alpha$ derivatives is also (just) enough. This coincidence seems suggestive, and we consider it possible that Theorem 1.1 and its conjectured improvement with 2α may in fact be valid for arbitrary $\alpha > 0$, not just $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$. We have not attempted to prove this, however. As a practical matter, trouble can be expected in floating-point arithmetic as sample points coalesce, so we regard the case $\alpha \geq 1/2$ as somewhat theoretical.

Going further, what if we allow arbitrary perturbations of the interpolation points, so that each $\tilde{x}_k$ may lie anywhere in $[-\pi, \pi)$? Doing so makes sense mathematically if f is infinitely differentiable; so in particular, it makes sense if f is analytic, which implies that it can be analytically continued to a 2π-periodic function on the whole real line. We are now in an area of approximation theory (and potential theory) going back to the work of Runge [15] and Fejér [5], in which a major contributor was Joseph Walsh [6, 17]. For arbitrary x_k, convergence will occur if f is analytic in a sufficiently wide strip around the real axis in the complex x-plane. Repeated points are permitted, with interpolation at such points interpreted in the Hermite sense involving values of both the function and its derivatives. If the points x_k are *uniformly distributed* in the sense that the fraction of points falling in any interval $[a, b) \subseteq [-\pi, \pi)$ converges to $(b - a)/2\pi$ as $N \to \infty$, then it is enough for f to be analytic in *any* strip around the real axis. Such results were first developed for polynomial approximation on the unit circle of functions analytic in the unit disk, the so-called Fejér–Kalmár theorem [5, 10, 17]. The extension to functions analytic in an annulus was considered by Hlawka [7], and the equivalent problem of trigonometric interpolation of 2π-periodic functions on $[-\pi, \pi)$ was considered by Kis [11]. All these results may fail in practice because of rounding errors on the computer, however. For example, Figure 3.7 of [1] shows an example with uniformly distributed random interpolation points in $[-\pi, \pi)$, with rounding errors beginning to take over at $N \approx 20$. For the case of interpolation by algebraic polynomials, this kind of effect is familiar in the context of the Runge phenomenon, where polynomial interpolants in equispaced points in $[-1, 1]$ will diverge on a computer as $N \to \infty$ even for a function like $f(x) = \exp(x)$ for which in principle they should converge.

4. Sampling theory and the Kadec 1/4 theorem. The field of approximation theory goes back to Borel, de la Vallée Poussin, Fejér, Jackson, Lebesgue, and others at the beginning of the 20th century, and its central question might be characterized like this:

> *Given a function f of a certain regularity, how fast do its approximations of a given kind converge?*

For example, if f is periodic and analytic on $[-\pi, \pi)$, then its equispaced trigonometric interpolants converge exponentially. The same holds if f is analytic in a strip surrounding the whole real line and satisfies a decay condition at ∞, with trigonometric interpolants generalized to interpolatory series of sinc functions.

The field of sampling theory goes back to Gabor, Kotelnikov, Nyquist, Paley, Shannon, J. M. and E. T. Whittaker, and Wiener a few years later. Its central question might be characterized like this:

> *Given a function f of a certain regularity, which of its approximations of a given kind are exactly equal to f?*

For example, if f is periodic and analytic on $[-\pi,\pi)$, then its equispaced trigonometric interpolant is exact if f is band-limited (has a Fourier series of compact support) and the grid includes at least two points per wavelength for each wave number present in the series. The same holds if f is a band-limited analytic function on the whole real line, with the Fourier series generalized to the Fourier transform, and again with trigonometric interpolation generalized to sinc interpolation.

Obviously we have worded these characterizations to highlight the similarities between the two fields, which in fact differ in significant ways. Still, it is remarkable how little interaction there has been between the two. What makes this relevant to the present paper is that our theorems and orientation are very much those of approximation theory, whereas most of the scientific interest in perturbed grids in the past has been from the side of sampling theory, and the Kadec 1/4 theorem is the known result in this general area.

Kadec's theorem is an answer to a question of sampling theory that originates with Paley and Wiener [13]. The exponentials $\{\exp(i\lambda_k x)\}$, $-\infty < k < \infty$, form an orthonormal basis for $L^2[-\pi,\pi]$ if $\lambda_k = k$ for each k. Thus, the sampling theorist would say that one can recover a function $f \in L^2[-\pi,\pi]$ from its inner products with the functions $\{\exp(i\lambda_k x)\}$. Now suppose these wave numbers are perturbed so that $|\tilde{\lambda}_k - k| \le \alpha$ for some fixed α. Can one still recover the signal? Specifically, does the family $\{\exp(i\tilde{\lambda}_k x)\}$ form a *Riesz basis* for $L^2[-\pi,\pi]$, that is, a basis that is related to the original one by a bounded transformation with a bounded inverse? Paley and Wiener showed that this is always the case for $\alpha < 1/\pi^2$, and Levinson showed it is not always the case for $\alpha \ge 1/4$. Kadec's theorem shows that Levinson's construction was sharp: for any $\alpha < 1/4$, the family $\{\exp(i\tilde{\lambda}_k x)\}$ forms a Riesz basis [2, 3, 9, 18].

Note that the standard setting of Kadec's theorem involves perturbation of wave numbers from equispaced values, in contrast to the results of this paper, which involve perturbation of interpolation points from equispaced values. In view of the Fourier transform, however, these settings are related, so one might imagine, based on Kadec's theorem, that $\alpha = 1/4$ might be a critical value for trigonometric interpolation in perturbed points. Instead, we have found that the critical value is $\alpha = 1/2$.

We explain this apparent discrepancy as follows. The Paley–Wiener theory and Kadec's theorem are results concerning the L^2 norm, which in many applications would represent energy. In our application of trigonometric interpolation, something related to the L^2 norm does indeed happen at $\alpha = 1/4$. Suppose we look at a *2-norm Lebesgue constant* $\tilde{\Lambda}_N^{(2)}$ for the perturbed grid interpolation problem, defined as the operator norm on $L : f \mapsto \tilde{t}_N$ induced by the discrete ℓ^2-norm on the data $\{f(\tilde{x}_k)\}$ and on the Fourier coefficients of the interpolant $\tilde{t}_k$. Numerical experiments reported in Section 3.4.3 of [1] indicate that whereas the usual ∞-norm Lebesgue constant is unbounded for all α, $\tilde{\Lambda}_N^{(2)}$ is bounded as $N \to \infty$ for any $\alpha < 1/4$ but not always bounded for $\alpha \ge 1/4$. (Indeed Kadec's theorem may imply this result.) For $\alpha \in (1/4, 1/2)$, we conjecture $\tilde{\Lambda}_N^{(2)} = O(N^{4\alpha-1})$.

Thus a sampling theorist might say that for $\alpha \in [1/4, 1/2)$, trigonometric interpolation is *unstable* in the sense that it may amplify signals unboundedly in ℓ^2 as $N \to \infty$. On the other hand the approximation theorist might note that the instability is very weak, involving not even one power of N. Assuming that the conjectured sharpening of the estimate (1.9) of Theorem 1.1 is valid, one derivative of smoothness of f is enough to suppress the instability, ensuring $\|f - \tilde{t}_N\| \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$ for all $\alpha < 1/2$. The numerical analyst might add that on a computer, amplification of rounding errors by $o(N)$ is unlikely to cause trouble. For $\alpha \ge 1/2$, in strong contrast,

the amplification is unbounded in any norm even for finite N, and trouble is definitely to be expected.

5. Proof of the Lebesgue constant estimate, Theorem 2.1. A full proof of Theorem 2.1, filling 20 pages, is the subject of Chapter 4 of the first author's D. Phil. thesis [1]. Many detailed trigonometric estimates are involved, and we do not know how to shorten it significantly. For readers interested in full details, that chapter has been made available in the Supplementary Materials attached to this paper.

Here, we outline the argument. To prove the bound (2.2) on the Lebesgue constant,

$$\tilde{\Lambda}_N \le \frac{C(N^{4\alpha}-1)}{\alpha(1-2\alpha)}, \tag{5.1}$$

we begin by noting that $\tilde{\Lambda}_N$ is given by

$$\tilde{\Lambda}_N = \max_{x\in[-\pi,\pi]} \tilde{L}(x), \tag{5.2}$$

where $\tilde{L}$ is the Lebesgue function

$$\tilde{L}(x) = \sum_{k=-N}^{N} |\tilde{\ell}_k(x)|, \tag{5.3}$$

where $\tilde{\ell}_k$ is the kth Lagrange cardinal trigonometric polynomial for the perturbed grid,

$$\tilde{\ell}_k(x) = \prod_{j\ne k} \sin\Big(\frac{x-\tilde{x}_j}{2}\Big) \Big/ \sin\Big(\frac{\tilde{x}_k-\tilde{x}_j}{2}\Big). \tag{5.4}$$

The function $\tilde{\ell}_k(x)$ takes the values 1 at $\tilde{x}_k$ and 0 at the other grid points $\tilde{x}_j$, and the sum (5.3) adds up contributions at a point x from all the $2N+1$ cardinal functions associated with grid points to its left and right.

The argument begins by showing that on the interval $[x^*_{-(k+1)}, x^*_{-k}]$, $\tilde{\ell}_0$ satisfies the bound

$$|\tilde{\ell}_0(x)| \le M_k, \quad x\in[x^*_{-(k+1)}, x^*_{-k}], \quad 0\le k\le N, \tag{5.5}$$

for certain numbers $M_0,\dots,M_N$, independently of the choice of perturbed points $\{\tilde{x}_k\}$. The points x^*_k are defined by $x^*_0=0$, $x^*_{-(N+1)}=-\pi$, and

$$x^*_k = 2\arctan\left(\frac{\cos(kh)-\cos(\alpha h)+\tan(\tilde{x}_0/2)\sin(kh)}{\tan(\tilde{x}_0/2)\big(\cos(kh)+\cos(\alpha h)\big)-\sin(kh)}\right), \quad -N\le k\le N, k\ne 0;$$

the most important fact about them is that they satisfy the inequalities

$$(k-\alpha)h \le x^*_k \le (k+\alpha)h, \quad -N\le k\le N.$$

Thus, (5.5) bounds $\tilde{\ell}_0$ on certain subintervals of $[-\pi,0]$. By exploiting symmetry, these bounds yield similar bounds on $\tilde{\ell}_0$ on similar subintervals of $[0,\pi]$ as well as

bounds on the other $2N$ contributions to $\tilde{L}$ in (5.3). We are eventually led to the estimate

$$\tilde{L}(x) \leq 9 \sum_{k=0}^{N} M_k,$$

which holds uniformly for $x \in [-\pi, \pi]$.

For sufficiently large N, the M_k satisfy

$$M_k \leq \frac{10\pi}{1-2\alpha}, \quad k = 0, 1 \tag{5.6}$$

and

$$M_k \leq \frac{3\pi(k+1)^{2\alpha}}{(1-2\alpha)(k-1)^{1-2\alpha}}, \quad 2 \leq k \leq N. \tag{5.7}$$

The bound (5.1) follows by an estimation of the sums of (5.6) and (5.7) over all k. The numbers M_k are defined by

$$M_k = \max_{x \in [-\pi, 0] \cap R_k} \frac{P_k(x)}{Q_k}, \quad 0 \leq k \leq N, \tag{5.8}$$

with

$$P_k(x) = \prod_{i=1}^{N} \left| \sin\left(\frac{x - (i-\alpha)h}{2} \right) \right| \times \prod_{i=1}^{k} \left| \sin\left(\frac{x + (i-\alpha)h}{2} \right) \right| \times \prod_{i=k+1}^{N} \left| \sin\left(\frac{x + (i+\alpha)h}{2} \right) \right|$$

and

$$Q_k = \prod_{i=1}^{N} \left| \sin\left(\frac{(2\alpha - i)h}{2} \right) \right| \times \prod_{i=1}^{k} \left| \sin\left(\frac{ih}{2} \right) \right| \times \prod_{i=k+1}^{N} \left| \sin\left(\frac{(2\alpha + i)h}{2} \right) \right|.$$

The set R_k in the definition of the range of the maximum in (5.8) is the interval

$$R_k = [(-k - 1 - \alpha)h, (-k + \alpha)h].$$

Acknowledgements. Many friends and colleagues have helped us along the way. In particular, we thank Stefan Güttel, Andrew Thompson, Alex Townsend, and Kuan Xu. Thompson showed us how we could improve $N^{4\alpha}$ to $N^{4\alpha} - 1$ in our main estimate (2.2).

REFERENCES

[1] A. P. Austin, *Some New Results on and Applications of Interpolation in Numerical Computation,* D. Phil. thesis, Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford, 2016.

[2] A. Aldroubi and K. Gröchenig, *Nonuniform sampling and reconstruction in shift-invariant spaces,* SIAM Rev., 43 (2001), pp. 585–620.

[3] O. Christensen, *An Introduction to Frames and Riesz Bases,* Birkhäuser, 2003.

[4] P. J. Davis, *On the numerical integration of periodic analytic functions,* in R. E. Langer, ed., On Numerical Integration: Proceedings of a Symposium, Madison, April 21–23, 1958, Math. Res. Ctr., U. of Wisconsin, 1959, pp. 45–59.

[5] L. Fejér, *Interpolation und konforme Abbildung,* Gött. Nachr. (1918), pp. 319–331.
[6] D. Gaier, *Lectures on Complex Approximation,* Birkhäuser, 1987.
[7] E. Hlawka, *Interpolation analytischer Funktionen auf dem Einheitskreis,* in P. Turán, ed., Number Theory and Analysis, Plenum, New York, 1969, pp. 99–118.
[8] D. Jackson, *The Theory of Approximation,* Amer. Math. Soc., 1930.
[9] M. I. Kadec, *The exact value of the Paley–Wiener constant,* Sov. Math. Dokl., 5 (1964), 559–561.
[10] L. Kalmár, *On interpolation,* Mat. Lapok, 33 (1926), pp. 120–149 (Hungarian).
[11] O. Kis, *On the convergence of the trigonometrical and harmonical interpolation,* Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hung., 7 (1956), pp. 173–200 (Russian).
[12] G. Meinardus, *Approximation of Functions: Theory and Numerical Methods,* Springer, 1967.
[13] R. E. A. C. Paley and N. Wiener, *Fourier Transforms in the Complex Domain,* Amer. Math. Soc., 1934.
[14] G. Pólya, *Über die Konvergenz von Quadraturverfahren,* Math. Z., 37 (1933), pp. 264–286.
[15] C. Runge, *Über empirische Funktionen und die Interpolation zwischen äquidistanten Ordinaten,* Z. Math. Phys., 46 (1901), pp. 224–243.
[16] L. N. Trefethen and J. A. C. Weideman, *The exponentially convergent trapezoidal rule,* SIAM Rev., 56 (2014), pp. 385–458.
[17] J. L. Walsh, *Interpolation and Approximation by Rational Functions in the Complex Domain,* Amer. Math. Soc., 1935.
[18] R. M. Young, *An Introduction to Non-Harmonic Fourier Series,* revised ed., Academic Press, 2001.

arXiv:1612.04018v1 [math.NA] 13 Dec 2016

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS: PROOF OF THEOREM 2.1

ANTHONY P. AUSTIN AND LLOYD N. TREFETHEN

In this supplementary appendix, we reproduce the proof of Theorem 2.1 given in [1, Ch. 4] with a few minor modifications to make the text self-contained. For ease of reference, we repeat our basic notational setup from the main article here. If $K = 2N + 1$ is an odd integer, the zero-centered equispaced grid of length K in $[-\pi, \pi)$ consists of the points

$$x_k = kh, \qquad -N \le k \le N, \tag{1}$$

where $h = 2\pi/K$ is the grid spacing. We consider the perturbed grid

$$\widetilde{x}_k = x_k + s_k h, \qquad |s_k| \le \alpha, \tag{2}$$

where the parameter α is a fixed value in the range $0 \le \alpha < 1/2$. The kth trigonometric Lagrange basis function associated with the perturbed grid is denoted by $\widetilde{\ell}_k$, i.e.

$$\widetilde{\ell}_k(x) = \prod_{\substack{j=-N \\ j\neq k}}^{N} \frac{\sin\left(\frac{x-\widetilde{x}_j}{2}\right)}{\sin\left(\frac{\widetilde{x}_k-\widetilde{x}_j}{2}\right)}.$$

We have $\widetilde{\ell}_k(x_j) = 1$ if $j = k$ and 0 if $j \neq k$. From (5.2) and (5.3) in the main article, we have

$$\widetilde{\Lambda}_N = \max_{x\in[-\pi,\pi]} \sum_{k=-N}^{N} |\widetilde{\ell}_k(x)|. \tag{3}$$

Our argument can be loosely outlined as follows. The bulk of the work is devoted to bounding $|\widetilde{\ell}_0(x)|$, which takes several steps to accomplish. Taking x as fixed, we determine the choice of the points $\widetilde{x}_j$ that maximizes $|\widetilde{\ell}_0(x)|$ and then bound the maximum using integrals. Since the resulting bound is independent of $\widetilde{x}_j$, we can exploit symmetry to obtain bounds on $|\widetilde{\ell}_k(x)|$ for $k \neq 0$. We then sum these bounds over k to obtain a bound on $\widetilde{\Lambda}_N$.

We begin with the following result, which shows that to bound $|\widetilde{\ell}_0(x)|$ we need consider only grids in which all the points, possibly aside from $\widetilde{x}_0$, are perturbed by the maximum amount of αh.

LEMMA 1. *For all $x \in [-\pi, \pi]$ and $-N \le j \le N$, $j \neq 0$,*

$$\left|\frac{\sin\left(\frac{x-\widetilde{x}_j}{2}\right)}{\sin\left(\frac{\widetilde{x}_0-\widetilde{x}_j}{2}\right)}\right| \le \max\left(\left|\frac{\sin\left(\frac{x-(j-\alpha)h}{2}\right)}{\sin\left(\frac{\widetilde{x}_0-(j-\alpha)h}{2}\right)}\right|, \left|\frac{\sin\left(\frac{x-(j+\alpha)h}{2}\right)}{\sin\left(\frac{\widetilde{x}_0-(j+\alpha)h}{2}\right)}\right|\right). \tag{4}$$

Proof. The statement is trivially true if $x = \widetilde{x}_0$. If $x \neq \widetilde{x}_0$, then from

$$\frac{d}{dt}\frac{\sin\left(\frac{x-t}{2}\right)}{\sin\left(\frac{\widetilde{x}_0-t}{2}\right)} = \frac{1}{2}\frac{\sin\left(\frac{x-\widetilde{x}_0}{2}\right)}{\left[\sin\left(\frac{\widetilde{x}_0-t}{2}\right)\right]^2},$$

we see that $t \mapsto \sin\big((x-t)/2\big)/\sin\big((\widetilde{x}_0-t)/2\big)$ has no critical points in $[-\pi,\pi]$ apart from $t=\widetilde{x}_0$, where it is singular. In particular, it has no critical points in any of the intervals $[(j-\alpha)h,(j+\alpha)h]$ for $-N \le j \le N$, $j \ne 0$, and therefore must assume its extreme values on these intervals at the endpoints. Since $\widetilde{x}_j \in [(j-\alpha)h,(j+\alpha)h]$ for each j, we are done. □

Which of the two arguments to the maximum function on the right-hand side of (4) is larger depends on both x and j. We need to understand the exact conditions under which each one takes over. Our first step in this direction is the following lemma, which tells us when the two are equal.

LEMMA 2. *For $0<\alpha<1/2$ and $-N \le j \le N$, $j \ne 0$, the equation*

$$\left|\frac{\sin\left(\frac{x-(j-\alpha)h}{2}\right)}{\sin\left(\frac{\widetilde{x}_0-(j-\alpha)h}{2}\right)}\right| = \left|\frac{\sin\left(\frac{x-(j+\alpha)h}{2}\right)}{\sin\left(\frac{\widetilde{x}_0-(j+\alpha)h}{2}\right)}\right| \tag{5}$$

has exactly two solutions in $[-\pi,\pi]$: $x=\widetilde{x}_0$ and $x=x_j^*$, where[1]

$$x_j^* = 2\arctan\left(\frac{\cos(jh)-\cos(\alpha h)+\tan\big(\widetilde{x}_0/2\big)\sin(jh)}{\tan\big(\widetilde{x}_0/2\big)\big(\cos(jh)+\cos(\alpha h)\big)-\sin(jh)}\right).$$

Proof. Multiplying through by the denominators of both sides and applying some trigonometric identities, we find that (5) can be reduced to

$$\left|\cos\left(\frac{\widetilde{x}_0-x}{2}+\alpha h\right)-\cos\left(\frac{\widetilde{x}_0+x}{2}-jh\right)\right| = \left|\cos\left(\frac{\widetilde{x}_0-x}{2}-\alpha h\right)-\cos\left(\frac{\widetilde{x}_0+x}{2}-jh\right)\right|. \tag{6}$$

If the expressions within the absolute value signs on either side of (6) are equal, then we have

$$\cos\left(\frac{\widetilde{x}_0-x}{2}+\alpha h\right) = \cos\left(\frac{\widetilde{x}_0-x}{2}-\alpha h\right).$$

In order to solve this equation, we consider two cases.

Case 1: $(\widetilde{x}_0-x)/2+\alpha h = (\widetilde{x}_0-x)/2-\alpha h+2n\pi$ for some integer n. Rearranging gives $\alpha h = n\pi$, and substituting for h, we arrive at $\alpha = Kn/2$. Since $\alpha<1/2$, this can hold only if $n=0$, in which case $\alpha=0$, but this is disallowed by our hypotheses.

Case 2: $(\widetilde{x}_0-x)/2+\alpha h = \alpha h-(\widetilde{x}_0-x)/2+2n\pi$ for some integer n. If this holds, then $\widetilde{x}_0-x = 4n\pi$, but this can happen only if $n=0$, since $\widetilde{x}_0-x \in [-\pi-\alpha h,\pi+\alpha h]$, and this interval is contained in $[-2\pi,2\pi]$ because $\alpha h \le \pi$. Thus, $x=\widetilde{x}_0$.

We conclude that $x=\widetilde{x}_0$ is the only solution when the expressions within the absolute value signs on either side of (6) are equal. On the other hand, if they are equal but of opposite sign, we get

$$2\cos\left(\frac{\widetilde{x}_0+x}{2}-jh\right) = \cos\left(\frac{\widetilde{x}_0-x}{2}+\alpha h\right)+\cos\left(\frac{\widetilde{x}_0-x}{2}-\alpha h\right).$$

[1] Here, arctan denotes the principal branch of the inverse tangent function.

Simplifying the right-hand side to $2\cos\big((\widetilde{x}_0 - x)/2\big)\cos(\alpha h)$ and then expanding both sides out completely using trigonometric identities, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}\cos\left(\frac{\widetilde{x}_0}{2}\right)\cos\left(\frac{x}{2}\right)\cos(jh) - \sin\left(\frac{\widetilde{x}_0}{2}\right)\sin\left(\frac{x}{2}\right)\cos(jh)& \\ + \sin\left(\frac{\widetilde{x}_0}{2}\right)\cos\left(\frac{x}{2}\right)\sin(jh) + \cos\left(\frac{\widetilde{x}_0}{2}\right)\sin\left(\frac{x}{2}\right)\sin(jh)& \\ = \cos\left(\frac{\widetilde{x}_0}{2}\right)\cos\left(\frac{x}{2}\right)\cos(\alpha h) + \sin\left(\frac{\widetilde{x}_0}{2}\right)\sin\left(\frac{x}{2}\right)\cos(\alpha h).&\end{aligned}$$

Dividing both sides of this through by $\cos(\widetilde{x}_0/2)\cos(x/2)$ and rearranging, we obtain

$$\tan\left(\frac{x}{2}\right) = \frac{\cos(jh) - \cos(\alpha h) + \tan\big(\widetilde{x}_0/2\big)\sin(jh)}{\tan\big(\widetilde{x}_0/2\big)\big(\cos(jh) + \cos(\alpha h)\big) - \sin(jh)}.$$

Taking the inverse tangent of both sides and multiplying by 2, we arrive at $x = x_j^*$. □

To move forward, we need a better understanding of the locations of the points x_j^*. The requisite inequalities are simple to state and are given in Lemma 4, but first we pause to establish a minor fact that we will need in their proof.

LEMMA 3. *For $|t| \le \alpha$ and $-N \le j \le N$, $j \neq 0$,*

$$\big|\sin\big((j+t)h\big)\big| > \sin\big((\alpha - |t|)h\big).$$

Proof. This is a consequence of the following chain of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned}0 \le (\alpha - |t|)h < (1 - |t|)h \le (|j| - |t|)h& \\ \le (|j| + |t|)h \le (N + |t|)h < \left(N + |t| + \frac{1}{2} - \alpha\right)h = \pi - (\alpha - |t|)h \le \pi.&\end{aligned}$$

□

LEMMA 4. *For $-N \le j \le N$, $j \neq 0$, and $0 < \alpha < 1/2$,*

$$(j - \alpha)h < x_j^* < (j + \alpha)h.$$

Proof. Let

$$f(t) = \frac{\cos(jh) - \cos(\alpha h) + t\sin(jh)}{t\big(\cos(jh) + \cos(\alpha h)\big) - \sin(jh)}.$$

Note that $f\big(\tan(\widetilde{x}_0/2)\big) = \tan(x_j^*/2)$. A straightforward computation using the quotient rule and some trigonometric identities shows that

$$f'(t) = -\left(\frac{\sin(\alpha h)}{t\big(\cos(jh) + \cos(\alpha h)\big) - \sin(jh)}\right)^2,$$

which is always negative wherever it is defined. By Lemma 3, we have $|\sin(jh)| > \sin(\alpha h)$ for each j. Furthermore, note that $j \neq 0$ implies $N \ge 1$, so that $\alpha h < \pi/3$,

and so $\cos(\alpha h) > 0$. Therefore, $|\cos(jh)+\cos(\alpha h)| \le 1+\cos(\alpha h)$ for each j. It follows that

$$\left|\frac{\sin(jh)}{\cos(jh)+\cos(\alpha h)}\right| > \frac{\sin(\alpha h)}{1+\cos(\alpha h)} = \tan\left(\frac{\alpha h}{2}\right).$$

Hence, the singularity in f is outside the interval $[\tan(-\alpha h/2), \tan(\alpha h/2)]$, and we conclude that

$$f\big(\tan(\alpha h/2)\big) \le f\big(\tan(\widetilde{x}_0/2)\big) \le f\big(\tan(-\alpha h/2)\big).$$

Next, consider the function g_+ and the number M_+ defined by

$$g_+(t) = \frac{\cos(jh) - t + \tan(-\alpha h/2)\sin(jh)}{\tan(-\alpha h/2)\big(\cos(jh)+t\big) - \sin(jh)},$$
$$M_+ = \frac{\cos(jh) - 1 + \tan(-\alpha h/2)\sin(jh)}{\tan(-\alpha h/2)\big(\cos(jh)-1\big) - \sin(jh)}.$$

Note that $g_+\big(\cos(\alpha h)\big) = f\big(\tan(-\alpha h/2)\big)$ and that

$$M_+ = \frac{\frac{\cos(jh)-1}{\sin(jh)} + \tan(-\alpha h/2)}{\tan(-\alpha h/2)\frac{\cos(jh)-1}{\sin(jh)} - 1} = \frac{\tan(jh/2) - \tan(-\alpha h/2)}{1+\tan(jh/2)\tan(-\alpha h/2)} = \tan\left(\frac{(j+\alpha)h}{2}\right).$$

Therefore, if we can show that $g_+\big(\cos(\alpha h)\big) < M_+$, we will have that $\tan(x_j^*/2) < \tan\big((j+\alpha)h/2\big)$, which implies that $x_j^* < (j+\alpha)h$, as desired. The remainder of the proof will be devoted to establishing this fact. The lower bound on x_j^* can be derived by considering the function g_- and the number M_- defined by

$$g_-(t) = \frac{\cos(jh) - t + \tan(\alpha h/2)\sin(jh)}{\tan(\alpha h/2)\big(\cos(jh)+t\big) - \sin(jh)},$$
$$M_- = \frac{\cos(jh) - 1 + \tan(\alpha h/2)\sin(jh)}{\tan(\alpha h/2)\big(\cos(jh)-1\big) - \sin(jh)}$$

and arguing similarly. We omit the details.

To show that $g_+\big(\cos(\alpha h)\big) < M_+$, we begin by noting that by multiplying the numerator and denominator of both $g_+(t)$ and M_+ by $\cos(-\alpha h/2)$ and applying some trigonometric identities, they can be rewritten as

$$g_+(t) = \frac{\cos(\alpha h/2)t - \cos\big((j+\alpha/2)h\big)}{\sin(\alpha h/2)t + \sin\big((j+\alpha/2)h\big)}, \qquad M_+ = -\frac{\cos(\alpha h/2) - \cos\big((j+\alpha/2)h\big)}{\sin(\alpha h/2) - \sin\big((j+\alpha/2)h\big)}.$$

Consider the affine function φ obtained by multiplying together the denominators in these new expressions for g_+ and M_+, where that of the latter is taken to include the leading minus sign:

$$\varphi(t) = -\sin(\alpha h/2)\Big(\sin(\alpha h/2) - \sin\big((j+\alpha/2)h\big)\Big)t \\ - \sin\big((j+\alpha/2)h\big)\Big(\sin(\alpha h/2) - \sin\big((j+\alpha/2)h\big)\Big).$$

We will show that $\varphi\big(\cos(\alpha h)\big) > 0$. First, note that $\varphi(t) = 0$ at $t = t_0 = -\sin\big((j+\alpha/2)h\big)/\sin(\alpha h/2)$ and that by Lemma 3, this point lies outside of the interval $[-1, 1]$.

Next, observe that $\sin(\alpha h/2) > 0$, that $\sin\big((j+\alpha/2)h\big)$ has the same sign as j, and that

$$\varphi'(t) = -\sin(\alpha h/2)\Big(\sin(\alpha h/2) - \sin\big((j+\alpha/2)h\big)\Big).$$

If $j < 0$, then $\sin(\alpha h/2) - \sin\big((j+\alpha/2)h\big) > 0$ trivially, so $\varphi'(t) < 0$. Thus, $\varphi(t) > 0$ for $t < t_0$. Inspecting the formula for t_0, we find that $t_0 > 0$ in this case. Since t_0 cannot lie in the interval $[-1, 1]$, it must further be true that $t_0 > 1$. As $\cos(\alpha h) \le 1$, we have that $\cos(\alpha h) < t_0$, as desired. On the other hand, if $j > 0$, then $\sin(\alpha h/2) - \sin\big((j+\alpha/2)h\big) < 0$ by Lemma 3, and we have that $\varphi'(t) > 0$, so that $\varphi(t) > 0$ for $t > t_0$. But $t_0 < 0$ in this case, and since $\cos(\alpha h) > 0$, we have $\cos(\alpha h) > t_0$, and we are done.

It follows that $g_+\big(\cos(\alpha h)\big) < M_+$ is equivalent to the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} -\Big(\cos(\alpha h/2)\cos(\alpha h) - \cos\big((j+\alpha/2)h\big)\Big)\Big(\sin(\alpha h/2) - \sin\big((j+\alpha/2)h\big)\Big) \\ < \Big(\sin(\alpha h/2)\cos(\alpha h) + \sin\big((j+\alpha/2)h\big)\Big)\Big(\cos(\alpha h/2) - \cos\big((j+\alpha/2)h\big)\Big). \end{aligned}$$

Expanding out the products, moving all terms involving $\cos(\alpha h)$ to the left and those not involving it to the right, and using some trigonometric identities to simplify the result, we find that this in turn is equivalent to

$$\Big(\sin\big((j+\alpha)h\big) - \sin(\alpha h)\Big)\cos(\alpha h) < \sin(jh).$$

Next, we expand $\sin\big((j+\alpha)h\big)$ and move all terms involving $\sin(jh)$ to the right, leaving us with

$$\big(\cos(jh) - 1\big)\sin(\alpha h)\cos(\alpha h) < \sin(jh)\big(1 - \big(\cos(\alpha h)\big)^2\big).$$

Using the identities $1 - \cos(jh) = \sin(jh)\tan(jh/2)$ and $1 - \big(\cos(\alpha h)\big)^2 = \sin\big(\alpha h\big)^2$, we can rearrange this one more time to find that our original inequality is equivalent to

$$\sin(jh)\big(\tan(\alpha h) + \tan(jh/2)\big) > 0.$$

If $j > 0$, then since $\sin(jh) > 0$, this is equivalent to $-\tan(jh/2) < \tan(\alpha h)$, which holds trivially, since the left-hand side is negative, while the right-hand side is positive. If $j < 0$, then $\sin(jh) < 0$, and the inequality is equivalent to $-\tan(jh/2) > \tan(\alpha h)$. Taking inverse tangents, we see that this is equivalent to $\alpha < -j/2$, and this inequality holds, since $-j \ge 1$ and $\alpha < 1/2$. This completes the proof. ∎

Assembling these results, we can prove the following statement about the right-hand side of (4).

LEMMA 5. *We have*

$$\max\left(\left|\frac{\sin\left(\frac{x-(j-\alpha)h}{2}\right)}{\sin\left(\frac{\widetilde{x}_0-(j-\alpha)h}{2}\right)}\right|, \left|\frac{\sin\left(\frac{x-(j+\alpha)h}{2}\right)}{\sin\left(\frac{\widetilde{x}_0-(j+\alpha)h}{2}\right)}\right|\right) = \left|\frac{\sin\left(\frac{x-(j-\alpha)h}{2}\right)}{\sin\left(\frac{\widetilde{x}_0-(j-\alpha)h}{2}\right)}\right|$$

when $1 \le j \le N$ *and* $x \in [-\pi, \widetilde{x}_0] \cup [x_j^*, \pi]$ *or when* $-N \le j \le -1$ *and* $x \in [x_j^*, \widetilde{x}_0]$, *and*

$$\max\left(\left|\frac{\sin\left(\frac{x-(j-\alpha)h}{2}\right)}{\sin\left(\frac{\widetilde{x}_0-(j-\alpha)h}{2}\right)}\right|, \left|\frac{\sin\left(\frac{x-(j+\alpha)h}{2}\right)}{\sin\left(\frac{\widetilde{x}_0-(j+\alpha)h}{2}\right)}\right|\right) = \left|\frac{\sin\left(\frac{x-(j+\alpha)h}{2}\right)}{\sin\left(\frac{\widetilde{x}_0-(j+\alpha)h}{2}\right)}\right|$$

when $1 \le j \le N$ *and* $x \in [\widetilde{x}_0, x_j^*]$ *or when* $-N \le j \le -1$ *and* $x \in [-\pi, x_j^*] \cup [\widetilde{x}_0, \pi]$.

Proof. We will give the proof assuming $1 \le j \le N$; the proof for $-N \le j \le -1$ is similar. When $\alpha = 0$, there is nothing to prove, so we may assume $\alpha > 0$. By Lemma 2, the two arguments of the maximum function are equal only at $x = \widetilde{x}_0$ and $x = x_j^*$, and by Lemma 4, we have $-\pi < \widetilde{x}_0 < (j-\alpha)h < x_j^* < (j+\alpha)h < \pi$. Evaluating both arguments of the maximum function at $x = (j-\alpha)h$, we see that the first is zero, while the second is nonzero. Thus, the second must be the larger on $[\widetilde{x}_0, x_j^*]$. Evaluating at $x = (j+\alpha)h$, the situation is reversed, and by periodicity we find that the first must be the larger on $[-\pi, \widetilde{x}_0] \cup [x_j^*, \pi]$. ∎

This lemma is all we need for maximizing the factors in $|\widetilde{\ell}_0(x)|$ with respect to the $\widetilde{x}_j$ for $j \ne 0$. We would like to do something similar for $\widetilde{x}_0$. Unfortunately, the dependence on $\widetilde{x}_0$ of the various cases in this result tells us that we cannot go further and maximize any one factor over $\widetilde{x}_0$ independently of x. The next result shows that we can get around this by pairing up the factors at $\pm j$ for $1 \le j \le N$ instead of considering them in isolation.

Note that we state the result only for $x \in [-\pi, 0]$. The reason is that, by symmetry, any bound we obtain on $|\widetilde{\ell}_0(x)|$ for $x \in [-\pi, 0]$ that is independent of x must also hold for $x \in [0, \pi]$. We will therefore ignore the case of $x \in [0, \pi]$ until we reach the end of our argument, at which point we will see that it has been taken care of for free. Alternatively, one could write out an analogous argument that assumes $x \in [0, \pi]$ instead.

LEMMA 6. *For* $x \in [-\pi, 0]$ *and* $1 \le j \le N$,

$$\left|\frac{\sin\left(\frac{x-\widetilde{x}_{-j}}{2}\right)\sin\left(\frac{x-\widetilde{x}_j}{2}\right)}{\sin\left(\frac{\widetilde{x}_0-\widetilde{x}_{-j}}{2}\right)\sin\left(\frac{\widetilde{x}_0-\widetilde{x}_j}{2}\right)}\right| \le \begin{cases} \left|\dfrac{\sin\left(\frac{x+(j-\alpha)h}{2}\right)\sin\left(\frac{x-(j-\alpha)h}{2}\right)}{\sin\left(\frac{jh}{2}\right)\sin\left(\frac{(2\alpha-j)h}{2}\right)}\right| & -\pi \le x \le x_{-j}^* \\ \left|\dfrac{\sin\left(\frac{x+(j+\alpha)h}{2}\right)\sin\left(\frac{x-(j-\alpha)h}{2}\right)}{\sin\left(\frac{(2\alpha+j)h}{2}\right)\sin\left(\frac{(2\alpha-j)h}{2}\right)}\right| & x_{-j}^* \le x \le 0. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Fix x, and define the functions f_1, f_2, and f_3 by

$$f_1(t) = \frac{\sin\left(\frac{x+(j-\alpha)h}{2}\right)\sin\left(\frac{x-(j-\alpha)h}{2}\right)}{\sin\left(\frac{t+(j-\alpha)h}{2}\right)\sin\left(\frac{t-(j-\alpha)h}{2}\right)} = \frac{\cos\big((j-\alpha)h\big)-\cos(x)}{\cos\big((j-\alpha)h\big)-\cos(t)}$$

$$f_2(t) = \frac{\sin\left(\frac{x+(j+\alpha)h}{2}\right)\sin\left(\frac{x-(j-\alpha)h}{2}\right)}{\sin\left(\frac{t+(j+\alpha)h}{2}\right)\sin\left(\frac{t-(j-\alpha)h}{2}\right)} = \frac{\cos(jh)-\cos(x+\alpha h)}{\cos(jh)-\cos(t+\alpha h)}$$

$$f_3(t) = \frac{\sin\left(\frac{x+(j-\alpha)h}{2}\right)\sin\left(\frac{x-(j+\alpha)h}{2}\right)}{\sin\left(\frac{t+(j-\alpha)h}{2}\right)\sin\left(\frac{t-(j+\alpha)h}{2}\right)} = \frac{\cos(jh)-\cos(x-\alpha h)}{\cos(jh)-\cos(t-\alpha h)}.$$

Note that only the denominators of these functions vary with t; the numerators are constant. By Lemma 5, we have

$$\left|\frac{\sin\left(\frac{x-\widetilde{x}_{-j}}{2}\right)\sin\left(\frac{x-\widetilde{x}_j}{2}\right)}{\sin\left(\frac{\widetilde{x}_0-\widetilde{x}_{-j}}{2}\right)\sin\left(\frac{\widetilde{x}_0-\widetilde{x}_j}{2}\right)}\right| \leq \begin{cases} |f_1(\widetilde{x}_0)| & -\pi \leq x \leq x^*_{-j} \\ |f_2(\widetilde{x}_0)| & x^*_{-j} \leq x \leq \widetilde{x}_0 \\ |f_3(\widetilde{x}_0)| & \widetilde{x}_0 \leq x \leq x^*_j. \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

Recalling that $\widetilde{x}_0 \in [-\alpha h, \alpha h]$, by maximizing $|f_1(t)|$, $|f_2(t)|$, and $|f_3(t)|$ over $t \in [-\alpha h, \alpha h]$ under the appropriate conditions on x, we will show that this inequality may be replaced by

$$\left|\frac{\sin\left(\frac{x-\widetilde{x}_{-j}}{2}\right)\sin\left(\frac{x-\widetilde{x}_j}{2}\right)}{\sin\left(\frac{\widetilde{x}_0-\widetilde{x}_{-j}}{2}\right)\sin\left(\frac{\widetilde{x}_0-\widetilde{x}_j}{2}\right)}\right| \leq \begin{cases} |f_1(\alpha h)| & -\pi \leq x \leq x^*_{-j} \\ |f_2(\alpha h)| & x^*_{-j} \leq x \leq 0, \end{cases}$$

and this is the inequality we are trying to establish. We consider three cases.

Case 1: $-\pi \leq x \leq x^*_{-j}$. In this case, the right-hand side of (7) is governed by f_1. The denominator of f_1 has a critical point in $[-\alpha h, \alpha h]$ at $t = 0$, and it takes on identical values at the endpoints $\pm\alpha h$. Since

$$0 < \alpha h < (1-\alpha)h \leq (j-\alpha)h \leq (N-\alpha)h < \left(N + \frac{1}{2}\right)h = \pi,$$

we have $\cos\big((j-\alpha)h\big) \leq \cos(\alpha h) \leq 1$, and so $\big|\cos\big((j-\alpha)h\big) - \cos(\alpha h)\big| \leq \big|\cos\big((j-\alpha)h\big) - 1\big|$. Thus, the denominator is smallest in magnitude at $t = \pm\alpha h$. Since the numerator of f_1 does not vary with t, we are done.

Case 2: $x^*_{-j} \leq x \leq -\alpha h$. Here, the behavior of (7) is determined by f_2. The only critical point of the denominator f_2 in $[-\alpha h, \alpha h]$ is at the left endpoint, where it takes the value $\cos(jh) - 1$. At the right endpoint, the denominator is $\cos(jh) - \cos(2\alpha h)$. From

$$0 < 2\alpha h < h \leq jh \leq Nh < \left(N + \frac{1}{2}\right)h = \pi,$$

we see that $\cos(jh) \leq \cos(2\alpha h) \leq 1$, and so we have $|\cos(jh) - \cos(\alpha h)| \leq |\cos(jh) - 1|$. Thus, the denominator is smallest in magnitude at $t = \alpha h$, and we are done, as in the previous case.

Case 3: $-\alpha h \leq x \leq 0$. In this case, for $-\alpha h \leq \widetilde{x}_0 \leq x$, the right-hand side of (7) is governed by f_3, while for $x \leq \widetilde{x}_0 \leq \alpha h$, it is governed by f_2. From the previous case, we know that the maximum absolute value of $f_2(t)$ for $t \in [-\alpha h, \alpha h]$ occurs at $t = \alpha h$, and a virtually identical argument shows that the maximum absolute value of $f_3(t)$ over the same range occurs at $t = -\alpha h$. We are thus left to compare $|f_3(-\alpha h)|$ and $|f_2(\alpha h)|$. Since these two quantities have the same denominator, we need only compare their numerators. The conditions on x imply that

$$0 \leq \alpha h + x \leq \alpha h - x \leq 2\alpha h \leq jh < \pi,$$

the later inequalities following as in the developments of the previous case. Therefore, $\cos(jh) \leq \cos(x - \alpha h) \leq \cos(x + \alpha h)$, which implies that $|\cos(jh) - \cos(x - \alpha h)| \leq |\cos(jh) - \cos(x + \alpha h)|$. It follows that $|f_2(\alpha h)| \geq |f_3(-\alpha h)|$, as desired. ∎

We can now prove the following result, which gives a bound on $|\widetilde{\ell}_0(x)|$ for $x \in [-\pi, 0]$ that is independent of the points $\widetilde{x}_j$. First, we introduce some additional

notation that we will need for the remainder of our argument. Define $x_0^* = 0$ and $x_{-N-1}^* = -\pi$. For $0 \le k \le N$, let $R_k^* = [x_{-k-1}^*, x_{-k}^*]$ and $R_k = [(-k-1-\alpha)h, (-k+\alpha)h]$. Observe that $\bigcup_{k=0}^N R_k^* = [-\pi, 0]$. Again for $0 \le k \le N$, let

$$P_k(x) = \prod_{j=1}^{N} \left|\sin\left(\frac{x-(j-\alpha)h}{2}\right)\right| \times \prod_{j=1}^{k} \left|\sin\left(\frac{x+(j-\alpha)h}{2}\right)\right| \times \prod_{j=k+1}^{N} \left|\sin\left(\frac{x+(j+\alpha)h}{2}\right)\right|,$$

and let

$$Q_k = \prod_{j=1}^{N} \left|\sin\left(\frac{(2\alpha-j)h}{2}\right)\right| \times \prod_{j=1}^{k} \left|\sin\left(\frac{jh}{2}\right)\right| \times \prod_{j=k+1}^{N} \left|\sin\left(\frac{(2\alpha+j)h}{2}\right)\right|.$$

Define

$$M_k = \max_{x \in [-\pi,0] \cap R_k} \frac{P_k(x)}{Q_k},$$

and note that M_k does not depend on the points $\widetilde{x}_j$.

LEMMA 7. *For $0 \le k \le N$ and $x \in R_k^*$, we have $|\widetilde{\ell}_0(x)| \le M_k$.*

Proof. Multiply together the inequalities derived in Lemma 6 for $1 \le j \le N$, and note that $R_k^* \subset R_k$ by Lemma 4. □

Next, we turn to bounding M_k. Our strategy will be to reduce the products $P_k(x)$ and Q_k to sums by taking logarithms and then bounding the sums using integrals. We begin with $P_k(x)$, which requires more work than Q_k because of its dependence on x. The bound that we need is given by Lemma 14, but before presenting it, we first establish several minor technical results that we will need in its proof.

LEMMA 8. *For $0 \le k \le N$ and $x \in R_k$,*

$$\left|\sin\left(\frac{x+(k-\alpha)h}{2}\right)\sin\left(\frac{x+(k+1+\alpha)h}{2}\right)\right| \le \left|\sin\left(\frac{(\alpha+1/2)h}{2}\right)\right|^2.$$

Proof. The derivative of the expression inside the absolute value signs on the left-hand side of this inequality is $(1/2)\sin\big(x+(k+1/2)h\big)$, which vanishes inside R_k only at $x = -(k+1/2)h$. The maximum absolute value of the expression must occur at this point, since it is zero at the endpoints of R_k. Substituting this value in for x in the left-hand side, we arrive at the right-hand side. □

LEMMA 9. *For $1 \le k \le N$ and $x \in R_k$,*

$$\left|\sin\left(\frac{x-(1-\alpha)h}{2}\right)\sin\left(\frac{x+(1-\alpha)h}{2}\right)\right| \ge \left|\sin\left(\frac{(k+1-2\alpha)h}{2}\right)\sin\left(\frac{(k-1)h}{2}\right)\right|.$$

Proof. Let $f(x)$ be the expression inside the absolute value signs on the left-hand side of this inequality. Applying some trigonometric identities, we find that $f(x) = \cos\big((1-\alpha)h\big)/2 - \cos(x)/2$. If $1 \le k \le N-1$, then since

$$0 \le (1-\alpha)h \le (k-\alpha)h \le -x \le (k+1+\alpha)h \le (N+\alpha)h < \pi,$$

we have $\cos(x) \le \cos\big((1-\alpha)h\big)$, and so $f(x) \ge 0$ for $x \in R_k$. The same string of inequalities shows that $f'(x) = \sin(x)/2$ is negative on R_k, so f is decreasing on R_k. Therefore, the smallest absolute value of f is obtained by evaluating at the right endpoint $x = (-k+\alpha)h$, and this produces the expression on the right-hand side of the inequality to be established.

For the $k = N$ case, we note that f has a critical point in R_N at the midpoint $x = -\pi$. Since $f''(x) = \cos(x)/2$, we have $f''(-\pi) = -1/2$, and so this point is a local maximum. Thus, the minimum must occur at one of the two endpoints. Noting that f is even about π, the value of f must be the same at both endpoints, so we may as well pick the right endpoint $x = (-N+\alpha)h$. Since $0 \le (1-\alpha)h \le (N-\alpha)h \le \pi$, the value of f at this endpoint is nonnegative, completing the proof. □

LEMMA 10. *For $K \ge 3$ and $x \in R_0$,*

$$\left|\sin\left(\frac{x-(1-\alpha)h}{2}\right)\sin\left(\frac{x+(1+\alpha)h}{2}\right)\right| \le \left|\sin\left(\frac{h}{2}\right)\right|^2.$$

Proof. As in the previous argument, let $f(x)$ be the expression inside the absolute value signs on the left-hand side of the inequality, and note that $f(x) = \cos(h)/2 - \cos(x+\alpha h)/2$. Since

$$-\pi < -h \le x + \alpha h \le 2\alpha h \le h < \pi,$$

for $x \in R_0$, we have $\cos(h) \le \cos(x+\alpha h)$ for $x \in R_0$, and it follows that f is negative on R_0. Since $\cos(x+\alpha h) \le 1$, we have $0 \ge f(x) \ge \cos(h)/2 - 1/2$. This lower bound is attained for $x \in R_0$ at $x = -\alpha h$. Thus, f attains its maximum absolute value on R_0 at $x = -\alpha h$, and substituting this value into the original expression for f yields the claimed inequality. □

LEMMA 11. *For $K \ge 3$ and $x \in R_1$, the following inequalities hold:*

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\sin\left(\frac{x-(1-\alpha)h}{2}\right)\right| &\ge \left|\sin\big((1-\alpha)h\big)\right|, \\
\left|\sin\left(\frac{x+(1-\alpha)h}{2}\right)\right| &\le \left|\sin\left(\frac{(1+2\alpha)h}{2}\right)\right|, \\
\left|\sin\left(\frac{x+(2+\alpha)h}{2}\right)\right| &\le \left|\sin\left(\frac{(1+2\alpha)h}{2}\right)\right|.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. The first inequality follows from

$$-\pi \le -\frac{3}{2}h \le \frac{x-(1-\alpha)h}{2} \le (\alpha-1)h \le 0,$$

the second from

$$-\pi \le -\frac{(1+2\alpha)h}{2} \le \frac{x+(1-\alpha)h}{2} \le 0,$$

and the third from

$$0 \le \frac{x+(2+\alpha)h}{2} \le \frac{(1+2\alpha)h}{2} \le \pi.$$

□

LEMMA 12. *For $0 \le k \le N$ and $x \in R_k$,*

$$[x+(k-\alpha)h]\log\left(-\frac{x+(k-\alpha)h}{2}\right)-[x+(k+1+\alpha)h]\log\left(\frac{x+(k+1+\alpha)h}{2}\right) \le -(1+2\alpha)h\log\left(\frac{(\alpha+1/2)h}{2}\right).$$

Proof. Let $f(x)$ be the expression on the left-hand side of this inequality. The derivative of f is

$$f'(x)=\log\left(-\frac{x+(k-\alpha)h}{x+(k+1+\alpha)h}\right),$$

and this vanishes in R_k only at the point $x=-(k+1/2)h$. Since $f(x)$ tends to $-\infty$ as x approaches the endpoints of R_k, f must assume its maximum value on R_k at this point. Evaluating f at this point yields the right-hand side of the claimed inequality. □

LEMMA 13. *For $x \in R_0$,*

$$\big(x-(1-\alpha)h\big)\log\left(-\frac{x-(1-\alpha)h}{2}\right) - \big(x+(1+\alpha)h\big)\log\left(\frac{x+(1+\alpha)h}{2}\right) \le -2h\log\left(\frac{h}{2}\right).$$

Proof. As in the previous argument, let $f(x)$ be the expression on the left-hand side of the inequality. We have

$$f'(x)=\log\left(-\frac{x+(\alpha-1)h}{x+(\alpha+1)h}\right),$$

and this vanishes in R_0 only at the point $x=-\alpha h$. Moreover,

$$f''(x)=\frac{2h}{(x+\alpha h)^2-h^2}.$$

The denominator of this function is a quadratic polynomial with positive leading coefficient and zeroes at $(-1-\alpha)h$ and $(1-\alpha)h$. Since $x \in R_0$, we have $(-1-\alpha)h \le x \le \alpha h < (1-\alpha)h$, and it follows that f'' is negative everywhere on R_0. This implies that f has a global maximum on R_0 at the critical point at $-\alpha h$ that we just found. Evaluating $f(-\alpha h)$ produces the right-hand side of the inequality to be established. □

LEMMA 14. *For sufficiently large K and $x \in R_k$, $0 \le k \le N$, we have*

$$P_k(x) \le 5\cdot 2^{-K}K$$

for $k=0,1$ and

$$P_k(x) \le 3\cdot 2^{-K}K^{2\alpha}\left|\sin\left(\frac{(k+1-2\alpha)h}{2}\right)\sin\left(\frac{(k-1)h}{2}\right)\right|^{\alpha-1/2}$$

for $2 \le k \le N$.

Proof. Let $S_k(x) = \log P_k(x)$. For $1 \le j \le N$, define $a_j(x)$, $b_j(x)$, and $c_j(x)$ by

$$a_j(x) = \log\left|\sin\left(\frac{x-(j-\alpha)h}{2}\right)\right|,$$
$$b_j(x) = \log\left|\sin\left(\frac{x+(j-\alpha)h}{2}\right)\right|,$$
$$c_j(x) = \log\left|\sin\left(\frac{x+(j+\alpha)h}{2}\right)\right|.$$

For brevity, we will typically suppress the argument when referring to these quantities, writing a_j in place of $a_j(x)$, and so forth. Let

$$A_k(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \frac{1}{2}h(a_j + a_{j+1}),$$
$$B_k(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{1}{2}h(b_j + b_{j+1}),$$
$$C_k(x) = \sum_{j=k+1}^{N-1} \frac{1}{2}h(c_j + c_{j+1}),$$

and note that

$$hS_k(x) = A_k(x) + B_k(x) + C_k(x) + \frac{1}{2}h(a_1 + a_N + b_1 + b_k + c_{k+1} + c_N).$$

The sums $A_k(x)$, $B_k(x)$, and $C_k(x)$ are composite trapezoidal rule approximations to the integral of $\log\left|\sin\big((x+t)/2\big)\right|$ (with respect to t) over certain subintervals of $[-\pi, \pi]$. Since this function is concave-down everywhere on $[-\pi, \pi]$, these approximations will yield lower bounds on the corresponding integrals [2, p. 54]. More precisely, we have

$$A_k(x) \le \int_{-(N-\alpha)h}^{-(1-\alpha)h} \log\left|\sin\left(\frac{x+t}{2}\right)\right| \, dt,$$
$$B_k(x) \le \int_{(1-\alpha)h}^{(k-\alpha)h} \log\left|\sin\left(\frac{x+t}{2}\right)\right| \, dt,$$
$$C_k(x) \le \int_{(k+1+\alpha)h}^{(N+\alpha)h} \log\left|\sin\left(\frac{x+t}{2}\right)\right| \, dt,$$

where the inequality for $B_k(x)$ holds for $1 \le k \le N$ and the inequality for $C_k(x)$ holds for $0 \le k \le N-1$. We consider four cases.

Case 1: $2 \le k \le N-1$. In this case, the preceding developments yield

$$hS_k(x) \le \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} - \int_{-\pi}^{-(N-\alpha)h} - \int_{-(1-\alpha)h}^{(1-\alpha)h} - \int_{(k-\alpha)h}^{(k+1+\alpha)h} - \int_{(N+\alpha)h}^{\pi} \log\left|\sin\left(\frac{x+t}{2}\right)\right| \, dt$$
$$+ \frac{1}{2}h(a_1 + a_N + b_1 + b_k + c_{k+1} + c_N).$$

Now we just need to bound the integrals and loose terms on the right-hand side of this inequality. It turns out that the first integral can be evaluated explicitly [3, 4.384-7]:

$$\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \log\left|\sin\left(\frac{x+t}{2}\right)\right| \, dt = -\pi \log(4). \tag{8}$$

For the second and fifth integrals, we have the following bound, which can be derived by applying the trapezoidal rule to the integral from $(N+\alpha)h$ to $2\pi-(N-\alpha)h$ and using the periodicity of the integrand:

$$-\int_{-\pi}^{-(N-\alpha)h} - \int_{(N+\alpha)h}^{\pi} \log\left|\sin\left(\frac{x+t}{2}\right)\right| \, dt \le -\frac{1}{2}h(a_N + c_N). \tag{9}$$

The fourth integral requires some care, since it has a singularity in the interval of integration at the point $t=-x$. (Recall our assumption that $x \in R_k = [(-k-1-\alpha)h, (-k+\alpha)h]$.) We therefore split the integral into two parts at that point. Noting the expansion

$$\log\big(\sin(t)\big) = \log(t) - \frac{1}{6}t^2 - \frac{1}{180}t^4 + O(t^6)_{t\to 0^+}, \tag{10}$$

we have

$$-\int_{(k-\alpha)h}^{-x} \log\left|\sin\left(\frac{x+t}{2}\right)\right| \, dt = \big(x+(k-\alpha)h\big)\left[\log\left(-\frac{x+(k-\alpha)h}{2}\right) - 1\right] + O(h^3)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}-\int_{-x}^{(k+1+\alpha)h} &\log\left|\sin\left(\frac{x+t}{2}\right)\right| \, dt \\ &= \big(x+(k+1+\alpha)h\big)\left[1 - \log\left(\frac{x+(k+1+\alpha)h}{2}\right)\right] + O(h^3).\end{aligned}$$

Adding these expressions together and applying Lemma 12, we obtain

$$-\int_{(k-\alpha)h}^{(k+1+\alpha)h} \log\left|\sin\left(\frac{x+t}{2}\right)\right| \, dt \le (1+2\alpha)h - (1+2\alpha)h\log\left(\frac{(\alpha+1/2)h}{2}\right) + O(h^3).$$

For the third integral, we use another trapezoidal rule bound and combine the result with the loose terms $(1/2)h(a_1+b_1)$ to yield

$$\begin{aligned}-\int_{-(1-\alpha)h}^{(1-\alpha)h} \log\left|\sin\left(\frac{x+t}{2}\right)\right| \, dt + \frac{1}{2}h(a_1+b_1) &\le \left(\alpha-\frac{1}{2}\right)h(a_1+b_1) \\ &\le \left(\alpha-\frac{1}{2}\right)h\log\left|\sin\left(\frac{(k+1-2\alpha)h}{2}\right)\sin\left(\frac{(k-1)h}{2}\right)\right|, \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where the second inequality follows from Lemma 9 and the fact that $\alpha < 1/2$. By Lemma 8 and (10), we now have

$$\frac{1}{2}h(b_k + c_{k+1}) \le h\log\left(\frac{(\alpha+1/2)h}{2}\right) + O(h^3). \tag{12}$$

Putting all of these results together, we conclude that

$$hS_k(x) \le -\pi\log(4) + \left(\alpha-\frac{1}{2}\right)h\log\left|\sin\left(\frac{(k+1-2\alpha)h}{2}\right)\sin\left(\frac{(k-1)h}{2}\right)\right| - 2\alpha h\log\left(\frac{(\alpha+1/2)h}{2}\right) + (1+2\alpha)h + O(h^3). \quad (13)$$

Dividing through by h, exponentiating, and suitably relaxing the constants that emerge, we obtain the claimed bound in this case.

Case 2: $k = 1$. This case is similar to the previous one. In particular, all the same integral bounds apply except that the second inequality in (11) is meaningless because the argument to the logarithm function vanishes. We replace (11) and (12) with

$$-\int_{-(1-\alpha)h}^{(1-\alpha)h}\log\left|\sin\left(\frac{x+t}{2}\right)\right|\,dt + \frac{1}{2}h(a_1+2b_1+c_2) \le \left(\alpha-\frac{1}{2}\right)ha_1 + \frac{1}{2}hc_2 + \alpha hb_1 \le \left(\alpha-\frac{1}{2}\right)h\log\big((1-\alpha)h\big) + \left(\alpha+\frac{1}{2}\right)h\log\left(\frac{(1+2\alpha)h}{2}\right) + O(h^3),$$

where the second inequality follows from Lemma 11 and (10). Combining this with the other results just established, we obtain

$$hS_1(x) \le -\pi\log(4) + \left(\alpha-\frac{1}{2}\right)h\log\big((1-\alpha)h\big) + \left(\alpha+\frac{1}{2}\right)h\log\left(\frac{(1+2\alpha)h}{2}\right) - (1+2\alpha)h\log\left(\frac{(\alpha+1/2)h}{2}\right) + (1+2\alpha)h + O(h^3),$$

and this implies the claimed bound for this case.

Case 3: $k = N$. Since $C_N(x)$ has no terms, we have, in this case,

$$hS_N(x) \le \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} - \int_{-\pi}^{-(N-\alpha)h} - \int_{-(1-\alpha)h}^{(1-\alpha)h} - \int_{(N-\alpha)h}^{\pi}\log\left|\sin\left(\frac{x+t}{2}\right)\right|\,dt + \frac{1}{2}h(a_1+a_N+b_1+b_N).$$

We can bound the third integral and the loose terms $(1/2)h(a_1+b_1)$ using (11); however, we cannot use (9) to bound the second and fourth integrals. Instead, noting that there is a singularity at $-x$ (or a periodic image thereof) within the domain of integration, we use (10) to find that

$$-\int_{(N-\alpha)h}^{-x}\log\left|\sin\left(\frac{x+t}{2}\right)\right|\,dt = \big(x+(N-\alpha)h\big)\left[\log\left(-\frac{x+(N-\alpha)h}{2}\right)-1\right]+O(h^3)$$

and

$$-\int_{-x}^{2\pi-(N-\alpha)h}\log\left|\sin\left(\frac{x+t}{2}\right)\right|\,dt = \big(2\pi+x-(N-\alpha)h\big)\left[1-\log\left(\frac{2\pi+x-(N-\alpha)h}{2}\right)\right]+O(h^3).$$

Noting that $2\pi + x - (N-\alpha)h = x + (N+1+\alpha)h$, we can add these together and use periodicity and Lemma 12 to obtain

$$-\int_{-\pi}^{-(N-\alpha)h} - \int_{(N-\alpha)h}^{\pi} \log\left|\sin\left(\frac{x+t}{2}\right)\right| dt \\ \leq (1+2\alpha)h - (1+2\alpha)h\log\left(\frac{(\alpha+1/2)h}{2}\right) + O(h^3).$$

By the same identity, Lemma 8, and (10), we have

$$\frac{1}{2}h(a_N + b_N) \leq h\log\left(\frac{(\alpha+1/2)h}{2}\right) + O(h^3).$$

Putting everything together, we arrive once again at (13), which finishes the argument in this case.

Case 4: $k = 0$. As $B_0(x)$ has no terms, we have

$$hS_0(x) \leq \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} - \int_{-\pi}^{-(N-\alpha)h} - \int_{-(1-\alpha)h}^{(1+\alpha)h} - \int_{(N+\alpha)h}^{\pi} \log\left|\sin\left(\frac{x+t}{2}\right)\right| dt \\ + \frac{1}{2}h(a_1 + a_N + c_1 + c_N).$$

We can take care of the second and fourth integrals and the loose terms $(1/2)h(a_N + c_N)$ using (9). For the third integral, noting that $-x$ lies in the interval of integration, we use (10) one more time to conclude that

$$-\int_{-(1-\alpha)h}^{-x} \log\left|\sin\left(\frac{x+t}{2}\right)\right| dt = \big(x-(1-\alpha)h\big)\left[\log\left(-\frac{x-(1-\alpha)h}{2}\right) - 1\right] + O(h^3)$$

and

$$-\int_{-x}^{(1+\alpha)h} \log\left|\sin\left(\frac{x+t}{2}\right)\right| dt = \big(x+(1+\alpha)h\big)\left[1 - \log\left(\frac{x+(1+\alpha)h}{2}\right)\right] + O(h^3).$$

Adding these together and using Lemma 13, we have

$$-\int_{-(1-\alpha)h}^{(1+\alpha)h} \log\left|\sin\left(\frac{x+t}{2}\right)\right| dt \leq -2h\log\left(\frac{h}{2}\right) + 2h + O(h^3).$$

By Lemma 10 and (10), we have

$$\frac{1}{2}h(a_1 + c_1) \leq h\log\left(\frac{h}{2}\right) + O(h^3).$$

Assembling all these facts, we find that

$$hS_0(x) \leq -\pi\log(4) - h\log\left(\frac{h}{2}\right) + 2h + O(h^3),$$

and upon dividing through by h, exponentiating, and adjusting the constant factors that arise, we obtain the desired result.

All cases have now been handled. The proof is complete. □

Next, we bound Q_k. The result we need is the following:

LEMMA 15. *For sufficiently large K,*

$$Q_k \geq (1-2\alpha)2^{-K}K^{1-2\alpha}\left|\sin\left(\frac{(k+1/2+\alpha)h}{2}\right)\right|^{-2\alpha}.$$

Proof. The proof is similar in structure to that of Lemma 14. Let $S_k = \log(Q_k)$, so that

$$S_k = \sum_{j=1}^{N}\log\left|\sin\left(\frac{(2\alpha-j)h}{2}\right)\right| + \sum_{j=1}^{k}\log\left|\sin\left(\frac{jh}{2}\right)\right| + \sum_{j=k+1}^{N}\log\left|\sin\left(\frac{(2\alpha+j)h}{2}\right)\right|. \tag{14}$$

We will bound S_k using integrals of $\log\left|\sin(t/2)\right|$, just as before; but this time, since we seek a lower bound, we use the midpoint rule instead of the trapezoidal rule [2, p. 54]. Assuming $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1/4$, we have

$$hS_k \geq \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} - \int_{(2\alpha-1/2)h}^{h/2} - \int_{(k+1/2)h}^{(k+2\alpha+1/2)h}\log\left|\sin\left(\frac{t}{2}\right)\right|\,dt. \tag{15}$$

We evaluated the first integral in (8), above. We bound the third integral using the midpoint rule:

$$-\int_{(k+1/2)h}^{(k+2\alpha+1/2)h}\log\left|\sin\left(\frac{t}{2}\right)\right|\,dt \geq -2\alpha h\log\left|\sin\left(\frac{(k+1/2+\alpha)h}{2}\right)\right|.$$

For the second integral, we split the interval of integration at the singularity at 0 and use (10) to compute

$$-\int_{(2\alpha-1/2)h}^{h/2}\log\left|\sin\left(\frac{t}{2}\right)\right|\,dt = \left(2\alpha-\frac{1}{2}\right)h\log\left(\frac{(1/2-2\alpha)h}{2}\right) - \frac{h}{2}\log\left(\frac{h}{4}\right) + (1-2\alpha)h + O(h^3).$$

From these results, it follows that

$$hS_k \geq -\pi\log(4) - 2\alpha h\log\left|\sin\left(\frac{(k+1/2+\alpha)h}{2}\right)\right| + \left(2\alpha-\frac{1}{2}\right)h\log\left(\frac{(1/2-2\alpha)h}{2}\right) - \frac{h}{2}\log\left(\frac{h}{4}\right) + (1-2\alpha)h + O(h^3).$$

Dividing through by h, exponentiating, and suitably adjusting the constant factors that arise, we obtain the claimed result.

If $1/4 < \alpha < 1/2$, the argument is similar except that we have to track the $j = 1$ term in the first sum in the definition of S_k independently. We write

$$hS_k \geq \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} - \int_{(2\alpha-3/2)h}^{h/2} - \int_{(k+1/2)h}^{(k+2\alpha+1/2)h}\log\left|\sin\left(\frac{t}{2}\right)\right|\,dt + h\log\left|\sin\left(\frac{(2\alpha-1)h}{2}\right)\right|.$$

Using (10) one last time, we compute

$$h\log\left|\sin\left(\frac{(2\alpha-1)h}{2}\right)\right| = h\log\left(\frac{(1-2\alpha)h}{2}\right) + O(h^3).$$

and

$$-\int_{(2\alpha-3/2)h}^{h/2} \log\left|\sin\left(\frac{t}{2}\right)\right| \, dt = \left(2\alpha - \frac{3}{2}\right)\log\left(\frac{(3/2-2\alpha)h}{2}\right) - \frac{h}{2}\log\left(\frac{h}{4}\right) + 2(1-\alpha)h + O(h^3).$$

Therefore,

$$hS_k \geq -\pi\log(4) - 2\alpha h\log\left|\sin\left(\frac{(k+1/2+\alpha)h}{2}\right)\right| + h\log\left(\frac{(1-2\alpha)h}{2}\right) + \left(2\alpha-\frac{3}{2}\right)\log\left(\frac{(3/2-2\alpha)h}{2}\right) - \frac{h}{2}\log\left(\frac{h}{4}\right) + 2(1-\alpha)h + O(h^3).$$

and this implies the claimed bound in the usual way. □

Note that the proof of this lemma shows that the constant $1-2\alpha$ can be dropped from the bound when $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1/4$. We have chosen for simplicity to include it in this case anyway because omitting it will at best improve our final results by a small constant factor.

At this point, we have all that we need to bound $|\widetilde{\ell}_0(x)|$ uniformly for $x \in [-\pi,\pi]$ and independent of the points $\widetilde{x}_j$: evaluate the bounds on M_k for $x \in [-\pi,0] \cap R_k$ given by Lemmas 14 and 15, and take the maximum over k. Lemma 7 shows that the result bounds $|\widetilde{\ell}_0(x)|$ for $x \in [-\pi,0]$. By symmetry, the same bound must hold for $x \in [0,\pi]$ as well. Even further, by considering circular rotations of the points $\widetilde{x}_j$, the bound can be seen to apply to $|\widetilde{\ell}_k(x)|$ for $k \neq 0$. Therefore, by (3), we could bound $\widetilde{\Lambda}_N$ by multiplying the bound on $|\widetilde{\ell}_0(x)|$ by K.

We can do better than this, however, because Lemmas 7 and 14 retain some information about how $|\widetilde{\ell}_0(x)|$ varies with x through the hypothesis that $x \in R_k$. We can use this information to get a better bound on $|\widetilde{\ell}_k(x)|$ for $k \neq 0$ than the one just described. The result we need is given by the following lemma, which we could have proved earlier but have delayed until now.

LEMMA 16. *If $x \in R_p^*$, $0 \leq p \leq N$, then for $-N \leq k \leq N$,*

$$|\widetilde{\ell}_k(x)| \leq \begin{cases} \max(M_{-(p+k)}, M_{-(p+k+1)}, M_{-(p+k+2)}) & -N \leq p+k \leq -2 \\ \max(M_0, M_1) & p+k = -1, 0 \\ \max(M_{p+k-1}, M_{p+k}, M_{p+k+1}) & 1 \leq p+k \leq N-1 \\ \max(M_{N-1}, M_N) & p+k = N \\ \max(M_{K-(p+k)}, M_{K-(p+k+1)}, M_{K-(p+k+2)}) & N+1 \leq p+k \leq 2N-1 \\ \max(M_0, M_1) & p+k = 2N. \end{cases} \tag{16}$$

Proof. For $k = 0$, the result follows from Lemma 7, which actually gives a stronger bound. The proof for $k \neq 0$ is ultimately just a matter of reducing it to the $k = 0$ case by exploiting circular and reflectional symmetry; however, there are some subtleties, so we will spell out the details to make things clear. Note that $x \in R_p^*$ implies $x \in R_p$ by Lemma 4.

First, suppose that $1 \le k \le N$. Then, $1 \le p+k \le 2N$, so only the last four cases in (16) are relevant. Let

$$\hat{x}_j = \begin{cases} \widetilde{x}_{j+k} - kh & -N \le j \le N-k \\ \widetilde{x}_{j+k-K} + 2\pi - kh & N-k+1 \le j \le N. \end{cases}$$

These points are just a circular shift in $[-\pi, \pi]$ of the points $\widetilde{x}_j$ by kh. It follows that $\widetilde{\ell}_k(x) = \hat{\ell}_0(x - kh)$, where $\hat{\ell}_0$ is the (trigonometric) Lagrange basis function for the points $\hat{x}_j$ that takes on the value 1 at $\hat{x}_0$. One can easily check that

$$\hat{x}_j = \begin{cases} x_j + t_{j+k}h & -N \le j \le N-k \\ x_j + t_{j+k-K}h & N-k+1 \le j \le N, \end{cases}$$

where the x_j are the equispaced points (1), and the t_j are defined by (2). Thus, the points $\hat{x}_j$ constitute a set of perturbed equispaced points of the sort that we have been considering. In particular, we can use Lemma 7 to bound $\hat{\ell}_0(x - kh)$ and hence $\widetilde{\ell}_k(x)$. We consider several cases.

Case 1: $1 \le p + k \le N - 1$. Since $x \in R_p$, it follows that $x - kh \in R_{p+k}$, which means that $x - kh$ must belong to one of R^*_{p+k-1}, R^*_{p+k}, and R^*_{p+k+1}, again by Lemma 4. By Lemma 7, $|\hat{\ell}_0(x - kh)| \le \max(M_{p+k-1}, M_{p+k}, M_{p+k+1})$.

Case 2: $p + k = N$ *and* $(-p - 1/2)h \le x \le (-p + \alpha)h$. We have $x - kh \in R_N$. Moreover, $x - kh \ge (-p - k - 1/2)h = (-N - 1/2)h = -\pi$, so $x - kh \in [-\pi, 0] \cap R_N$. Thus, $x - kh$ belongs to either R^*_N or R^*_{N-1} by Lemma 4, and so Lemma 7 gives $|\hat{\ell}_0(x - kh)| \le \max(M_{N-1}, M_N)$.

Case 3: $p + k = N$ *and* $(-p - 1 - \alpha)h \le x < (-p - 1/2)h$. Again, we have $x - kh \in R_N$, but this time, $x - kh < \pi$. Nevertheless, $\hat{\ell}_0(x - kh) = \hat{\ell}_0(x - kh + 2\pi)$, and $x - kh + 2\pi \in [0, \pi] \cap -R_N$. By reflecting the problem about 0 (i.e., replacing $\hat{x}_j$ with $-\hat{x}_j$ for each j and $x - kh + 2\pi$ by $-(x - kh + 2\pi) \in [-\pi, 0] \cap R_N$), and applying Lemma 7, we obtain $|\hat{\ell}_0(x - kh)| \le \max(M_{N-1}, M_N)$ as in the previous case.

Case 4: $N + 1 \le p + k \le 2N - 1$. Just as in the previous case, we will look not at $\hat{\ell}_0(x - kh)$ but at $\hat{\ell}_0(x - kh + 2\pi)$. Noting that $2\pi = Kh$, we see that $x - kh + 2\pi \in -R_{K-(p+k+1)}$. Since $x \ge -\pi$ and $k \le N$, we have $x - kh + 2\pi \ge -\pi + (K - N)h = h/2 > 0$. Thus, $x - kh + 2\pi \in [0, \pi] \cap -R_{K-(p+k+1)}$. Reflecting about 0 as was done in the previous case and noting that $-(x - kh + 2\pi)$ must belong to one of $R^*_{K-(p+k)}$, $R^*_{K-(p+k+1)}$, and $R^*_{K-(p+k+2)}$ by Lemma 4, we may apply Lemma 7 to conclude that $|\hat{\ell}_0(x - kh)| \le \max(M_{K-(p+k)}, M_{K-(p+k+1)}, M_{K-(p+k+2)})$.

Case 5: $p + k = 2N$. This is handled exactly the same as the previous case except that since $x - kh + 2\pi \in [0, \pi] \cap -R_0$, we have that $-(x - kh + 2\pi)$ can belong only to one of R^*_0 and R^*_1. Therefore, $|\hat{\ell}_0(x - kh)| \le \max(M_0, M_1)$.

For $-N \le k \le -1$, the argument is similar. In this case, the circularly shifted points $\hat{x}_j$ are

$$\hat{x}_j = \begin{cases} \widetilde{x}_{j+k} - kh & -N - k \le j \le N \\ \widetilde{x}_{j+k+K} - 2\pi - kh & -N \le j \le -N - k - 1, \end{cases}$$

so that

$$\hat{x}_j = \begin{cases} x_j + t_{j+k}h & -N - k \le j \le N \\ x_j + t_{j+k+K}h & -N \le j \le -N - k - 1. \end{cases}$$

Just as before, we have $\widetilde{\ell}_k(x) = \hat{\ell}_0(x - kh)$. Noting that $-N \le p + k \le N - 1$, the proof again breaks into cases as follows.

Case 1: $1 \le p+k \le N-1$. Just as in the previous Case 1, we have $x-kh \in R_{p+k}$, and the result follows in exactly the same way.

Case 2: $p + k = 0$ *and* $(-p - 1 - \alpha)h \le x \le -ph$. Here, $x - kh \in R_0$, and the restriction on x forces $x - kh \le 0$, so in fact, $x - kh \in [-\pi, 0] \cap R_0$. Therefore, $x - kh$ belongs to one of R_0^* and R_1^* by Lemma 4, and so by Lemma 7 we have $|\hat{\ell}_0(x - kh)| \le \max(M_0, M_1)$.

Case 3: $p + k = 0$ *and* $-ph < x \le (-p + \alpha)h$. Now $x - kh \in R_0$, but $0 < x - kh \le \alpha h$. To bound $\hat{\ell}_0(x - kh)$ in this case, we reflect the problem about 0 as we did in some of the cases for positive k above. Since $[-\alpha h, \alpha h] \subset R_0$, we have $-(x - kh) \in [-\pi, 0] \cap R_0$, and so Lemma 7 tells us that $|\hat{\ell}_0(x - kh)| \le \max(M_0, M_1)$ once again.

Case 4: $p + k = -1$ *and* $(-p - 1 - \alpha)h \le x \le (-p - 1)h$. In this case, $x - kh \in [-\alpha h, 0]$ and hence belongs to $[-\pi, 0] \cap R_0$. Applying Lemma 7, we have $|\hat{\ell}_0(x-kh)| \le \max(M_0, M_1)$ just as in the previous two cases.

Case 5: $p + k = -1$ *and* $(-p-1)h < x \le (-p+\alpha)h$. Now, $x - kh \in [0, \pi] \cap -R_0$. Reflecting in 0 and using Lemma 7 yet again, we have $|\hat{\ell}_0(x - kh)| \le \max(M_0, M_1)$.

Case 6: $-N \le p + k \le -2$. We have $x - kh \in -R_{-(p+k+1)}$. Since $-R_{-(p+k+1)} \subset [0, \pi]$, we reflect in 0 and observe that, by Lemma 4, $-(x - kh)$ belongs to one of $R^*_{-(p+k)}$, $R^*_{-(p+k+1)}$, and $R^*_{-(p+k+2)}$. Applying Lemma 7 one last time, we obtain $|\hat{\ell}_0(x - kh)| \le \max(M_{-(p+k)}, M_{-(p+k+1)}, M_{-(p+k+2)})$.

All cases have been handled. The proof is finished. □

The point of Lemma 16 is that it allows us to bound $\widetilde{\Lambda}_N$ by summing the bounds of Lemma 7 over k instead of maximizing them over k and multiplying by K as described previously.

LEMMA 17. *We have*

$$\widetilde{\Lambda}_N \le 9 \sum_{k=0}^{N} M_k. \tag{17}$$

Proof. Suppose that $x \in [-\pi, 0] \cap R_p^*$, $0 \le p \le N$. We can use Lemma 16 to bound the sum in (3) for this value of x by summing the right-hand side of (16) over $-N \le k \le N$. This is equivalent to summing it over the values of $p + k$ such that $-N + p \le p + k \le N + p$, and this is certainly bounded above by the sum over the larger range $-N \le p + k \le 2N$. Writing j in place of $p + k$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k=-N}^{N} |\widetilde{\ell}_k(x)| \le \sum_{j=-N}^{-2} \max(M_{-j}, M_{-(j+1)}, M_{-(j+2)}) + \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \max(M_{j-1}, M_j, M_{j+1}) \\ + \sum_{j=N+1}^{2N-1} \max(M_{K-j}, M_{K-(j+1)}, M_{K-(j+2)}) \\ + 3\max(M_0, M_1) + \max(M_{N-1}, M_N).\end{aligned}$$

Since $\max(a,b) \le a+b$ when $a,b \ge 0$, we can convert the maxima into sums to obtain

$$\sum_{k=-N}^{N} |\widetilde{\ell}_k(x)| \le \sum_{j=2}^{N} M_j + \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} M_j + \sum_{j=0}^{N-2} M_j + \sum_{j=0}^{N-2} M_j + \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} M_j + \sum_{j=2}^{N} M_j + \sum_{j=2}^{N} M_j + \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} M_j + \sum_{j=0}^{N-2} M_j + 3M_0 + 3M_1 + M_{N-1} + M_N$$

after simplifying the indices of summation. We immediately obtain

$$\sum_{k=-N}^{N} |\widetilde{\ell}_k(x)| \le 9 \sum_{j=0}^{N} M_j.$$

Since the right-hand side of this inequality is independent of p, this bound actually holds for all $x \in [-\pi, 0]$. Even further, since the M_j are independent of both x and the points (2), by symmetry, it holds for all $x \in [-\pi, \pi]$. The result now follows from (3). □

We can now prove Theorem 2.1 from the main article.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. We use Lemmas 14 and 15 to bound the right-hand side of (17). For K sufficiently large and $k = 0, 1$, we have

$$M_k \le \frac{5}{1-2\alpha} K^{2\alpha} \left| \sin\left(\frac{(k+1/2+\alpha)\pi}{K} \right) \right|^{2\alpha} \le \frac{5}{1-2\alpha} K^{2\alpha} \left| \frac{(k+1/2+\alpha)\pi}{K} \right|^{2\alpha} \le \frac{10\pi}{1-2\alpha}, \quad (18)$$

while for $2 \le k \le N$,

$$M_k \le \frac{3}{1-2\alpha} K^{4\alpha-1} \frac{\left| \sin\left(\frac{(k+1/2+\alpha)\pi}{K} \right) \right|^{2\alpha}}{\left| \sin\left(\frac{(k+1-2\alpha)\pi}{K} \right) \sin\left(\frac{(k-1)\pi}{K} \right) \right|^{1/2-\alpha}} \le \frac{3}{1-2\alpha} K^{4\alpha-1} \frac{\left| \sin\left(\frac{(k+1/2+\alpha)\pi}{K} \right) \right|^{2\alpha}}{\left| \sin\left(\frac{(k-1)\pi}{K} \right) \right|^{1-2\alpha}}.$$

In deriving the last expression, we have used the inequality

$$\left| \sin\left(\frac{(k+1-2\alpha)\pi}{K} \right) \right| \ge \left| \sin\left(\frac{(k-1)\pi}{K} \right) \right|,$$

which clearly holds for $2 \le k \le N-1$ and for $k = N$ with $1/4 \le \alpha < 1/2$, since in those cases, $(k+1-2\alpha)\pi/K \in [0, \pi/2]$, and $k+1-2\alpha \ge k > k-1$. To see that it holds for $k = N$ with $0 < \alpha < 1/4$ as well, note that in this case

$$\sin\left(\frac{(N+1-2\alpha)\pi}{K} \right) = \sin\left(\frac{(N+2\alpha)\pi}{K} \right)$$

by the symmetry of sine about $\pi/2$. Since $N + 2\alpha \in [0, \pi/2]$ and $N + 2\alpha > N - 1$, the inequality follows.

Using the inequalities $|\sin(x)| \le |x|$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $|\sin(x)| \ge (2/\pi)|x|$ for $|x| \le \pi/2$, we can simplify the bound on M_k for $2 \le k \le N$ even further to

$$M_k \le \frac{3}{1-2\alpha} K^{4\alpha-1} \frac{\left|\frac{(k+1/2+\alpha)\pi}{K}\right|^{2\alpha}}{\left|\frac{2(k-1)}{K}\right|^{1-2\alpha}} \le \frac{3\pi}{1-2\alpha} \frac{(k+1)^{2\alpha}}{(k-1)^{1-2\alpha}}. \tag{19}$$

The result now follows from summing the bounds on the M_k established in (18) and (19) and bounding the sum by interpreting it as a midpoint rule approximation[2] to the integral of a function that is concave-up (note that $N + 1/2 = K/2$):

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k=2}^{N} \frac{(k+1)^{2\alpha}}{(k-1)^{1-2\alpha}} &\le \int_{3/2}^{N+1/2} \frac{(x+1)^{2\alpha}}{(x-1)^{1-2\alpha}}\, dx \\ &\le (K/2+1)^{2\alpha} \int_{3/2}^{K/2} \frac{dx}{(x-1)^{1-2\alpha}} = \frac{(K^2/4-1)^{2\alpha} - (K/4+1/2)^{2\alpha}}{2\alpha} \\ &\le \frac{(K^2/4)^{2\alpha} - (K/4)^{2\alpha}}{2\alpha} = \frac{K^{4\alpha} - K^{2\alpha}}{4^{2\alpha} 2\alpha} \le \frac{K^{4\alpha} - 1}{2\alpha}.\end{aligned}$$

□

We close with a word about why our argument falls short of establishing the stronger bound on $\widetilde{\Lambda}_N$ that we conjecture involving $N^{2\alpha}$ instead of $N^{4\alpha}$. As summarized in the opening paragraphs of this appendix, our argument proceeds by choosing the perturbed points $\widetilde{x}_j$ to maximize $|\widetilde{\ell}_k|$ for a fixed value of k, bounding the maximum, and then summing the bounds. This is a different (and easier) problem than choosing the points to maximize the sum $\sum_{k=-N}^{N} |\widetilde{\ell}_k|$ and bounding that maximum instead.

In symbols, our argument bounds $\widetilde{\Lambda}_N$ by bounding the rightmost expression in the following chain of inequalities:

$$\widetilde{\Lambda}_N \le \max_{\widetilde{x}_{-N},\ldots,\widetilde{x}_N} \max_{x\in[-\pi,\pi]} \sum_{k=-N}^{N} |\widetilde{\ell}_k(x)| \le \max_{x\in[-\pi,\pi]} \sum_{k=-N}^{N} \max_{\widetilde{x}_{-N},\ldots,\widetilde{x}_N} |\widetilde{\ell}_k(x)|.$$

The loss enters in the passage to the rightmost expression from the one in the middle. To prove the stronger bound, one needs to consider the $|\widetilde{\ell}_k|$ all together at once in the sum instead of individually as we have done here.

REFERENCES

[1] A. P. Austin, *Some New Results on and Applications of Interpolation in Numerical Computation*, DPhil thesis, Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford, 2016.

[2] P. J. Davis and P. Rabinowitz, *Methods of Numerical Integration*, Academic Press, New York, 2nd ed., 1984.

[3] I. S. Gradshteyn and I. M. Ryzhik, *Table of Integrals, Series, and Products*, Elsevier, Burlington, MA, 7th ed., 2007.

[2] We thank Andrew Thompson for suggesting the use of the midpoint rule instead of a simpler Riemann sum. The latter yields a bound that does not have $O(\log K)$ behavior in the limit as $\alpha \to 0$.